



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/751,989 | 12/29/2000 | Michael P. Levosky | LEV-001 | 7705 |
| 26918 | 7590 | 05/23/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| WHITE & FUDALA 57 BEDFORD STREET SUITE 103 LEXINGTON, MA 02420 | | | OSMAN, RAMY M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2157 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,989

Applicant(s)

LEVOSKY, MICHAEL P.

Examiner

Ramy M. Osman

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,2,5 and 12-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,6-11 and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed on January 19, 2005. Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claim 29 recites the limitation "the client control program" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. Claim 29 recites the limitation "the alias email server" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In regards to step (a), it has not been established where the client control program resides. Is it on the client-side or is it on the server-side.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 24-26,28,3 and 6-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rochkind (US Patent No 6,161,129) in view of Gabber et al (Communications of the ACM, Vol. 42 No. 2, February 1999)[herein referred to as Gabber (ACM '99)] in further view of Gabber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,291) [herein referred to as Gabber '291].**

8. In reference to claim 29, Rochkind teaches in a computer data communications network, a method for a user to control and organize email, the user having a physical email address, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) entering of the physical email address, corresponding identification information, and filter commands into the client control program by the user; (b) transmitting the physical email address, the filter commands, and the corresponding identification information, to the alias email server. (column 5 lines 15-40 & 55-61, Rochkind inherently teaches a user interface that allows a user (i.e. subscriber) to enter information that will be used to generate an alias address by a messaging system)

Rochkind fails to explicitly teach the client control program of steps (a) and (b), for inputting the information. However, Gabber (ACM '99) teaches a client control program (i.e. user browser) to enter information to be sent to an alias server (i.e. LPWA system server) so that

Art Unit: 2157

the server can then generate an alias email address to be used by the user to avoid spam (pg 42 col.2, pg 43 col.2 and pg 44 col.1).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rochkind by making a client control program for entering of information to be sent to an alias server as per the teachings of Gabber (ACM '99) so that the server can then generate an alias email address to be used by the user to avoid spam.

(c) storing the physical email address, the commands, and the corresponding identification information, the alias email server (column 5 lines 15-20 & 55-61 and column 7 lines 25-40);

(d) automatically generating a first alias email address by the alias email server, comprising the physical address and not comprising a recipient address, and storing said first alias email address in the alias email server (column 5 lines 5-30);

(e) transmitting the first alias email address by the alias email server the client control program (column 5 lines 25-30);

(f) transmitting a message comprising the first alias email address as a sender address to a recipient. (column 5 lines 25-30, Rochkind teaches the user giving the alias email to a potential sender who would then send a message to the user.) Rochkind fails to explicitly teach where a message is transmitted with the alias to a recipient. However, Gabber '291 teaches preventing spam by generating alias source addresses to be used by a user to transmit messages via a remailer to a recipient. The user then filters incoming mail based on the alias source address that the user wishes to stop receiving mail from (Abstract, column 6 lines 40-60 and column 7 line 62 – column 8 line 20).

Art Unit: 2157

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rochkind by transmitting a message with the alias to a recipient as per the teachings of Gabber '291 so that the user can then filter incoming mail based on the alias source address that the user wishes to stop receiving mail from.

(g) receiving by the alias email server of a reply message addressed to the first alias email address (Rochkind teaches receiving messages by the messaging system that are addressed to the alias address (see column 5 lines 10-30). Rochkind also teaches receiving reply messages, but the reply messages are addressed to message identifiers instead of an alias address (see column 4 lines 50-65)). Rochkind fails to explicitly teach where the messages are reply messages. However, Gabber '291 teaches where the message is a reply message, in order to prevent spam that might be reply messages (column 8 lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rochkind by the server receiving a reply message addressed to the alias address as per the teachings of Gabber '291 so that the user can then prevent spam that might be reply messages.

(h) if the stored filter commands do not cause alias email server to block the reply message, then forwarding by the alias email server of the reply message, together with the identification information, the users physical address (column 5 lines 10-65),

so that the recipient unaware of the user's physical email address, and the user is apprised of the first alias email address and the corresponding identification information of said reply message (column 1 lines 35-67, column 2 lines 55-65 and column 5 lines 7-30).

9. In reference to claim 25, Rochkind teaches the method of claim 29, further comprising transmitting by the user a message to two or more recipients using the same alias first email

Art Unit: 2157

address and the same identification information (column 5 lines 20-50, Rochkind teaches providing more than one potential sender with the alias address).

10. In reference to claim 26, Rochkind teaches the method of claim 25 above. Rochkind fails to explicitly teach wherein the filter commands further comprise: (a) rejecting all messages addressed to the first alias email address at the alias email server; (b) suspending receipt of all messages addressed to the first alias email address by the alias email server; and (c) restoring receipt of all messages addressed to the first alias email address at the alias email server.

However, Gabber '291 teaches filtering incoming reply mail based on alias email address, and if the filtering does not block the reply message then allowing receipt of the message. This allows filtering of unwanted mail. (column 3 lines 20-51, column 8 lines 5-20 & 35-67 and column 9 lines 15-25)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rochkind by teaches filtering incoming reply mail based on alias email address, and if the filtering does not block the reply message then allowing receipt of the message as per the teachings of Gabber '291 so as to allow filtering of unwanted mail.

11. In reference to claim 3, Rochkind teaches the method of claim 25, further comprising, after receiving a message from a recipient addressed to the first alias email address:

(a) selecting by the user of the Reply function of the Email client program; (b) inputting of a reply message by the user; (c) transmitting of the users reply, message to the Alias Email server; (d) stripping the user's reply message of all information which could identify the user's physical email address by the Alias email server; and (e) forwarding the stripped reply message to the recipient (Rochkind, column 5 line 20 – column 6 line 26).

Art Unit: 2157

12. In reference to claim 6, Rochkind teaches claim 4 above, including wherein the generating of the alias Email address further comprises substantially random character generating (Gabber '291, column 5 line 50 – column 7 line 20).

13. In reference to claim 7, Rochkind teaches claim 6 above, including entering one or more additional physical Email addresses into the client control program, and receiving an additional alias Email address corresponding to each additional physical Email address (Gabber '291, Summary and column 5 lines 30-67).

14. In reference to claim 8, Rochkind teaches claim 7 above, including entering a request by the client control program for one or more additional alias addresses corresponding to each physical address, and receiving by the client control program an additional alias Email address corresponding to each such request (Gabber '291, Summary and column 5 lines 30-67).

15. In reference to claim 9, Rochkind teaches claim 8 above, including entering a request by the client control program to suspend forwarding by the alias Email server to the Email client program of all Email addressed to a particular alias Email address (Gabber '291, column 7 lines 35-67 and column 8 lines 5-20 & 35-67).

16. In reference to claim 10, Rochkind teaches claim 9 above, including teaches entering a request by the client control program to permanently discontinue receipt by the Email client program of all Email addressed to a particular alias Email address (Gabber '291, column 7 lines 35-67 and column 8 lines 5-20 & 35-67).

17. In reference to claim 11, Rochkind teaches claim 10 above, including generating by the client control program of an alias Email address containing a user name, and filtering the Email

Art Unit: 2157

at the Alias Email Server (Gabber '291, column 5 lines 30-67, column 7 lines 35-67 and column 8 lines 5-20 & 35-67).

18. Claims 4,27 and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rochkind (US Patent No 6,161,129) in view of Gabber et al (Communications of the ACM, Vol. 42 No. 2, February 1999) in further view of Gabber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,291) in further view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,553).

19. In reference to claims 4 and 27, Rochkind teaches the method of claims 3 and 26 respectively, including:

(a) entering one or more additional alias email addresses and identification information associated with each such additional alias email address by the user (Gabber (ACM '99), pg 42 col.2 and pg 43 col.1).

Rochkind fails to explicitly teach

(b) generating a log by the client control program, and displaying the log to the user, the log comprising, for each alias email address: (i) the date of the generation of the alias email address; (ii) the alias email address; and (iii) the corresponding identification information.

However, Lee teaches a list of email transactions (figures 14 & 35) which comprises time and date, email address and identification information (column 15 lines 55-67 and column 23 line 35 – column 24 line 15). Lee also teaches where the list can be sorted according to a variety of ways (column 25 lines 1-25).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gabber by including an email list with the above mentioned characteristics as per the teachings of Lee so that users can keep track of email messages.

20. In reference to claim 28, Rochkind teaches the method of claim 27, whereby (a) the email messages further comprise a subject and a body; and (b) the identification information comprises a first identification message and a second identification message, and whereby the method further comprises: (i) appending by the alias email server of the first identification message to the subject; and (ii) appending by the alias email server of the second identification message to the body. (Summary and column 4 line 25 – column 5 line 60).

Response to Amendment

21. Examiner acknowledges the amendment filed on 1/19/2005. Applicant cancelled claims 12 and 24, amended claims 3 and 25-28, and added new claim 29.

22. Examiner acknowledges amendment to the specification and figure 2 of the diagrams.

23. The affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132 filed on 1/19/2005 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of the claims based upon 103 (a) as set forth in the last Office action.

It states that the claimed subject matter solved a problem that was long standing in the art. However, there is no evidence that if persons skilled in the art who were presumably working on the problem knew of the teachings of the cited references, they would still be unable to solve the problem. See MPEP § 716.04. Although PC Magazine is a respected publication in the PC industry, it is not authoritative in establishing patentability of the instant application.

Art Unit: 2157

Applicant is directed to review the attached pertinent prior art to see how others of ordinary skill in the art were working on the problem since 1996.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments of points (1) and (2) (pgs 12-23 of remarks) with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

25. Applicants argument of point (3) (pg 14 of remarks), stating that Lee is non-analogous art is not persuasive. It has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Lee et al. is concerned with managing emails on a client program (see Summary).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M. Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO

May 11, 2005


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100